

UNITED STATES

Congress



OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93^d CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 119—PART 28

NOVEMBER 6, 1973 TO NOVEMBER 15, 1973

(PAGES 35989 TO 37438)

ion County chapter of Unico in 1969, and by the Roselle Civic Club in 1967.

Mr. President, I count it an honor and a real privilege to have known and worked with Mario Mirabelli over the years; he is truly an outstanding American.

CHRISTMAS TREES ON THE ELLIPSE AND THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. President, in a recent series of editorials, the Washington Post said "bah humbug" to the idea of cutting and transporting the 101 Christmas trees that traditionally adorned the Ellipse fronting the White House.

"Last year," wrote a Post editorialist, "about a million people from around town and all over the world trundled to Washington's Ellipse for a look at the national Christmas tree, centerpiece of the annual Pageant of Peace." Many of those folks, said the Post, "didn't like what they saw—because they felt it should not be necessary to cut down a huge, beautiful tree every year for 2 weeks decoration." The newspaper further lauded the Park Service for its proposal to plant a national Christmas tree as an example for those who find the chopping down of a 75-foot spruce wasteful.

For the information of those same people who might consider the cutting of a national Christmas tree a waste, the Post might have mentioned a few statistics on its own tree cutting.

Consider this:

According to figures supplied by national timber and paper associations, the Post's half million daily press run of editions that individually weigh about a pound, adds up to about 108 acres of trees. The huge Sunday edition, which weighs up to four pounds, uses paper from 424 acres of timber. The experts further estimate that, on the average, we are talking about 150 pulp trees per acre, and that adds up to a mere 16,200 trees per weekday, or 45,892 trees for a Sunday.

So during the recent 3-day wildcat strike, the Post gave a reprieve for about 90,000 trees. Not bad. Hats off to the Post.

EMERGENCY MILITARY ASSISTANCE TO ISRAEL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the excellent statement made by Mr. I. L. Kenen, chairman of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, before the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations of the Appropriations Committee last week.

Mr. Kenen urged the swift approval of the administration's request for emergency military assistance to Israel. Although this request gives the President authority to determine what percentage will be grant assistance and what percentage will be in the form of military sales credits, Mr. Kenen convincingly argues that Israel should be provided as much as possible of the \$2.2 billion in the form of grant aid.

He stated:

If Israel must borrow for the additional weapons she is acquiring this year, her debt service would rise to \$940 million (assuming a concessionary interest rate of two percent) or \$1.1 billion (if the interest rate is six percent). This is an astronomical burden beyond the capacity of an already super-taxed and super-indebted economy.

I know that my colleagues fully share Mr. Kenen's concern that we cannot allow a small country to be bankrupted, because of the aggression of others.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kenen's statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILITARY AID TO ISRAEL

(By I. L. Kenen)

I thank you for the privilege of appearing here on behalf of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee to urge approval of the Administration's request for emergency military assistance to Israel.

I have been informed by Mr. Jacob Stein, Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, which represents 30 major national Jewish organizations (see Appendix for list), that this body associates itself with the purpose of my statement today. I am similarly advised by Mr. Hyman Bookbinder, the Washington representative of the American Jewish Committee.

We are gratified that President Nixon, Secretary of State Kissinger, Secretary of Defense Schlesinger and the United States Congress responded swiftly and generously in declaration and action to assist Israel to defend herself against the eleven Arab states which sought to destroy her in the deplorable and unprovoked attack just 30 years ago.

If the United States had faltered and delayed and if the people of Israel had not received the needed equipment in time we might have witnessed a catastrophe. Many more people would have died, for the war would have been needlessly prolonged.

We are convinced that this war—actually the fifth since Israel was established in 1948—was not a war for territory, much of which the Arabs could have recovered by negotiation with Israel. It was not a war for the Palestinian Arabs, who were the victims of Arab leadership in 1948, when six Arab states invaded Palestine in the attempt to seize all of it for themselves. The Palestinian refugees could have been resettled by oil-rich Arab states long ago. This was a war for the liquidation of the Jewish state. And if the Arab armies had reached the old pre-June 1967 armistice lines, or if they had been able to start their offensive from those lines, the people of Israel would have been overwhelmed.

We strongly support the President's request for a \$2.2 billion appropriation to strengthen Israel. This is essential, not only to ensure Israel's survival but also to preserve the balance of strength in the Middle East—in the national interest of the United States as well as in the interest of our NATO allies.

And we look forward to a genuine peace, which, we believe, can be achieved if the United States and the Soviet Union encourage the Arabs to sit together with the Israelis and work out their own future co-existence and cooperation as sovereign peoples. We do not believe that purpose will be served if the great powers, in competition rather than cooperation, seek to impose a settlement.

It is an astonishing fact that ever since Israel was established in 1948, all the major powers have at one time or another provided weapons to her hostile Arab neighbors. And

in these last fateful 30 days, the Israel armed forces had to face the most sophisticated Soviet planes and missiles—MIG-21s, SA-3s, SA-6s and SA-7s, the Frog surface-to-surface missiles, French Mirage planes, British Hunter jets and Centurion tanks, and even some tanks furnished by the United States. And some of the Arab states and Arab guerrillas have received military aid from Communist China.

THE ROLE OF THE SOVIET UNION

But the "peace-loving" Soviet Union was the extravagant and benevolent provider. Despite its professed desire for detente with the United States, the Soviet Union has persisted in Russia's age-long ambition to dominate the Middle East. It expanded the supply of the most sophisticated weapons to the Arab states during the last year; while aware of the impending conflict, it took no steps to avert it—neither unilaterally nor in cooperation with the United States; it summoned all Arab states to the Arab colors; it operated a huge airlift to replace weapons which Arabs lost in the fighting; it did nothing to halt the fighting until it realized that the Arabs faced disaster—and it is still sending weapons to resupply the Arabs.

It should be recalled that the United States sent some \$11.1 billion in lend-lease aid to the Russians in World War II. Our Government recently agreed to wipe out that debt and to accept a nominal settlement of \$722 million.

That \$722 million which the Russians will gradually pay the United States is a tiny fraction of what this terrible war, subsidized and sustained by the Soviet Union, will cost Israel, the Arab states, the United States and the people of many other countries whose economies have been disrupted.

Ever since Egypt opened the Middle East to Soviet penetration by its 1955 arms deal with Czechoslovakia, the Communist countries have paced the arms race in the Middle East. But for many years, our country abstained from providing Israel with the weapons she needed, despite the fact that her neighbors were receiving arms from both East and West.

U.S. AID

The United States was willing to supply Israel economic assistance to enable her to resettle more than 1.5 million refugees and immigrants and to develop her economy. This aid was prudently and effectively used. Most of it was in the form of loans rather than grants—much of which the Israelis have repaid, with interest. But in the 1950s our Government was reluctant to furnish Israel with any arms, although it was sending them to Iraq and Saudi Arabia, and it acknowledged the need to maintain an arms balance. It was always argued that Israel's qualitative superiority—the skill and dedication of her soldiers—could compensate for the huge quantitative superiority of her foes, an argument demolished in the pushbutton warfare of the last month.

The United States referred the Israelis to France and to other European suppliers. It was not until 1962 that the United States finally agreed that Israel might buy the Hawk anti-aircraft missile. It was not until 1966 that the United States approved the sale of A-4 Skyhawks and tanks, and it was not until 1968 that the Administration finally agreed that Israel might be allowed to purchase Phantom jets.

But—and this must be emphasized—Israel had to pay for these weapons.

Between 1946 and 1972, according to AID, the United States provided grant military assistance totaling approximately \$55 billion, throughout the world.

None of this grant military assistance went to Israel, even though in this same period we provided grant military assistance and training totaling about \$324 million to nine Arab states, to which should be added \$34 million for Jordan in 1973.

The record also shows that our grant economic assistance to the Arab states far exceeds that given to Israel during this period. Jordan is a case in point.

In the meantime, Russia and other Communist countries have poured huge quantities of weapons—much of it at cut-rate prices—into Egypt, Iraq, Syria and six other Arab states, conservatively estimated at more than \$6 billion. No one knows how much Russia sent to the Arab states in the last year, and particularly in the last few weeks. But we have seen estimates ranging as high as \$3 billion. We may assume that the oil revenues of Egypt's allies collected by major international oil companies, including American corporations, will help to finance this enormous expenditure.

Israel's defense expenditures have been extremely high. They were 26 percent of her Gross National Product in 1972. While total costs of the current conflict are still not determined, it is estimated that military expenditures will approximate 40 percent of Israel's GNP this year. Most of this burden has to be carried by the Israel taxpayer, who is already taxed at the highest rate in the world, and who was forced to pay an additional seven to twelve percent compulsory defense loan last week.

Israelis had to go deeply into debt to finance defense and refugee resettlement. The figures show this rise in external debt.

External debt—as of January 1—In billions

1970	-----	\$2.1
1971	-----	2.6
1972	-----	3.4
1973	-----	4.1

As of the time of the outbreak of the war, the debt was estimated at \$4.5 billion. This means that for many years Israel has had the highest per capita foreign currency debt in the world. At the beginning of 1973 it stood at about \$1,300 per person. This huge debt has imposed a massive burden on the Israelis. Israel's external debt service cost \$532 million in 1971; \$687 million in 1972; for the current year it is estimated at \$705 million and it is expected to rise to \$790 million in 1974.

But if Israel must borrow for the additional weapons she is acquiring this year, her debt service would rise to \$940 million (assuming a concessionary interest rate of two percent) or \$1.1 billion (if the interest rate is six percent). This is an astronomical burden beyond the capacity of an already super-taxed and super-indebted economy.

We strongly believe that Israel should be allowed grant assistance.

When President Nixon sent his message, on Oct. 19, it was then reported that the cost of the equipment already sent to Israel totaled \$825 million. Israel estimates that the cost of the weapons she must have to regain and maintain her defense capability will approximate the \$2.2 billion figure the President has requested.

This is only part of the tremendous overall cost of the war. Israel was compelled to mobilize 30 percent of her labor force. As a result, only industry serving the war effort was able to continue. Building activity stopped. Almost all transportation had to be diverted to the war. Tourism, a major earner of foreign exchange, fell off sharply. Exports were curtailed (which will make it still more difficult for Israel to meet her debt service). Israel's annual growth rate, which has averaged 9.9 percent over the years, will be drastically reduced. On top of this, there will be heavy expenditures for war damages—for new housing and new equipment of all kinds. War damage to civilian facilities is estimated at \$100 million.

Israel's foreign currency reserves will be adversely affected by the new fighting. In a memorandum which we submitted to your Committee in August of this year in connec-

tion with the current foreign assistance programs, we wrote that Israel's reserves are low for a country "which is so dependent on imports for essentials and is in an exposed geopolitical situation. If the war were to break out again, reserves would go down sharply because of the need to buy additional materiel, because tourism would decline and also because Israel would have to mobilize people from factories and fields, sharply reducing production and the capacity to export."

Deplorably, this prediction turned out to be true. In addition to all this, there have been steep increases in the prices of many imported commodities, such as soybeans and other foodstuffs, fuel and raw materials. And Israel is now under an Arab blockade which cuts off her access to the Indian Ocean and the Orient.

The U.S. arms supply must continue because the Russians continue to pour weapons into the Arab states to enable them to threaten Israel with a resumption of the war in order to impose surrender. The experience of five wars has shown that Arabs will not make peace with an Israel they think they can destroy.

It must be kept in mind that the Israel government, unlike other governments which receive our weapons, has never asked for American manpower. While American forces helped to ship weapons to Israel, they were far removed from the scene of combat.

Arab capacity to make war has been heightened by the contributions of the oil-producing countries, as well as the willingness of the Soviet Union and some Western countries to sell arms to them.

Simultaneously, the Arabs are using the oil weapon to blackmail NATO countries, to alienate Israel's friends in Europe and Africa and to isolate her.

We believe that a civilized world cannot permit the Soviet Union and the Arab countries to accomplish the destruction of Israel. We believe that the support given to Israel by our Government in the recent fighting was entirely justified on moral grounds. At the same time, we submit that our Government's action has been entirely consistent with America's overall interest.

While the Soviet Union has called on Israel to withdraw to the pre-1967 lines, it has taken an entirely different position in Eastern Europe, where it has consolidated the territorial gains won by the Communist bloc in World War II. In the Middle East it maintains an aggressive posture. In brazen violation of the 1970 cease-fire standstill when it rushed missiles into the Suez area, it has transformed the region into a shooting gallery and it has used the Jewish people and their state as a target for the testing of the most sophisticated weapons. It has exploited the Arab war against Israel in a never-ending campaign to undermine the influence and interests of the United States in the area—diplomatic, economic and military.

Surely, it is in the interest of the United States to provide Israel with the means to maintain the balance and thus check the Soviet Union's war by proxy against the West. The young Israeli soldiers who died in this most costly of Arab-Israel wars were fighting not only to defend their own country but also a crucial frontier of freedom.

APPENDIX A

(Text of the telegram from Jacob Stein, Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations.)

It is my understanding that you are submitting testimony to the appropriate Congressional Committees considering the Administration's Emergency Security Assistance Act of 1973 ensuring military assistance for Israel to help her carry the burden of defense and to maintain her deterrent military capacity.

As Chairman of the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, embracing some 31 affiliated organizations, including your own, and representing almost the totality of the American Jewish community, I would like to inform you that the purpose of your presentation has the full support of the Conference of Presidents and we earnestly hope that the Committees before which you will testify will take favorable action.

The organizations affiliated with the Conference are:

American Israel Public Affairs Committee; American Jewish Congress; American Trade Union Council for Histadrut; American Zionist Federation; B'nai B'rith; B'nai B'rith Women; B'nai Zion; Central Conference of American Rabbis; Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds (observer); Hadassah; Jewish Labor Committee; Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation; Jewish War Veterans of the U.S.A.; Labor Zionist Alliance; Mizrahi-Hapoel Hamizrachi; Mizrahi Womens Organization of America; National Council of Jewish Women; National Council of Young Israel; National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods; National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council; National Jewish Welfare Board; North American Jewish Youth Council; Pioneer Women; Rabbinical Assembly; Rabbinical Council of America; Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Union of Orthodox Congregations of America; United Synagogue of America; Women's League for Conservative Judaism; World Zionist Organization-American Section, Inc.; Zionist Organization of America.

Text of the letter from the American Jewish Committee

This is to advise you and the Congress that the American Jewish Committee associates itself with the testimony you will be giving in support of the President's request for \$2.2 billion in military grants or credits for the State of Israel.

HYMAN BOOKBINDER,
Washington Representative.

IT'S TIME WE DEMAND IMPROVED JAPANESE CONDUCT IN NORTH PACIFIC FISHERIES

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, last week the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission—INPFC—met in Tokyo to formulate measures to regulate the 1974 fisheries harvests of the United States, Canada, and Japan in the North Pacific Ocean and Bering Sea. Of deep concern to the United States is the unrelenting Japanese toll of salmon on the high seas in disregard of evidence that the return of salmon to North American spawning streams is insufficient to perpetuate their kind. Japanese actions with regard to halibut are equally disturbing.

This body last June passed Senate Concurrent Resolution 11, expressing a policy of support of the U.S. fishing industry. Other legislation in committee would enable emergency interim action when necessary to prevent annihilation of our fish stocks prior to implementation of effective international agreements. We have so far restrained congressional action, because we were advised not to trigger drastic independent action by our Nation while there is a possibility that solutions can be attained in next year's Law of the Sea Conference. But we cannot afford to lose species through inaction. Surely those who are participants in these conferences must be losing hope.